



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,714	04/19/2001	Bo-In Lin	L&C2k01(09 / 839,714)	2769
7590	10/05/2005		EXAMINER	
Bo-In Lin 13445 Mandoli Drive Los Altos Hills, CA 94022			CHOW, MING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/839,714	LIN, BO-IN
	Examiner Ming Chow	Art Unit 2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “for automatically updating said database” is not clearly defined. It is unclear what is referred by the “for automatically updating”. Is it “a video camera.....for automatically updating said database”, or “a user’s presence..... automatically updating said database”, or “said location automatically updating said database”?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2645

2. Claims 2, 4-6, 10-14, 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al (US: 5946386), in view of Grimes et al (US: 5428663), and further in view of Cooper et al (US: 5892856).

For claims 2, 17, 19, 20, 22, regarding “a message routing means....of destinations”, Rogers et al teach on column 13 line 13-39 call routing.

Regarding “a database....destination number”, Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 16-20. The “one number “ of Rogers et al is the claimed “unified access number” (one number to send voice, fax and data calls). Rogers et al also teach on column 9 line 1-11 call management database includes caller identification information. As Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 16-20 the “one number” is used to identify the caller. Therefore, the “one number’ must be included in the call management database. Rogers et al teach on column 2 line 21-35 VIP rules for transferring calls (reads on the claimed “forwarding destination number”). Since the call management database includes the VIP rules (of transferring calls), the forwarding destination numbers must be included in the call management database.

Regarding “said database further....list of callers”, Rogers et al teach on column 25 line 56-60 the called party uses call control window (claimed “user interface”) to edit the primary caller ID database (of the call management databases).

Rogers et al teach on item 716 Fig. 7abc “updating said database for modifying first forwarding destination number”.

Rogers et al failed to teach “a video camera....for automatically detecting a user’s presence”. However, Grimes et al teach on column 2 line 37-68 a user presence detecting means detecting the location for call forwarding. And, “Official Notice” is taken that disposing the

presence detecting means at a location where associates with a forwarding destination to expect the user's presence is old and well known to one skilled in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al to have the "a user presence detecting means for automatically detecting a user's presence" as taught by Grimes et al such that the modified system of Rogers et al would be able to support the user presence detecting means to the system users.

Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al failed to teach "a user presence detecting means is a video camera". However, Cooper et al teach on item 418 Fig. 4, column 1 line 48- 56, a video camera is an apparatus for presence detection.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al to have the "a user presence detecting means is a video camera" as taught by Cooper et al such that the modified system of Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al would be able to support the user conveniences of using a video camera to detect presence.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Rogers et al teach on column 37 line 47-51 the user may change his "one number". Rogers et al also teach on column 44 line 19-21 the system user may call his own "one number" and enter a password for access authorization. This system of Rogers et al must register the system user in order to verify the entered password. The entering a password reads on the claimed "logging".

Regarding claim 6, Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 15-20 the “one number” is single unique telephone number to each user. Since the VIP rule of forwarding a call is based on the identity of the calling party (the “one number”), there must be a second forwarding destination number associated with a second caller.

Regarding claim 10, Rogers et al teach on column 38 line 47-48 rules of forwarding sequence of a FAX.

Regarding claim 11, Rogers et al teach on column 38 line 44-46 rules of time-dependent forwarding sequence.

Regarding claim 12, the sequential forwarding processes (as rejections stated in claims 10 and 11 above) taught by Rogers et al are based on rules stored in the call management database. The sequential forwarding taught by Rogers et al must be enabled by the database.

Regarding claim 13, Rogers et al teach on column 22 line 16-26 real-time control of calls, call transfers and call forwarding. The “real-time control” of Rogers et al reads on the claimed “simultaneous”.

Regarding claim 14, Rogers et al teach on column 22 line 18 e-mail is also one of message types supported by the Roger’s system.

Regarding claims 16, 18, 21, Rogers et al teach on column 3 line 44-48 applying priority to each call (reads on claimed “forwarding sequence of each of said callers”).

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al, and in view of Grimes et al, and in view of Cooper et al, and further in view of Junkin (US: 6493717), and further in view of Yamaguchi (US: 6499055).

All rejections as stated in claim 2 above apply.

Rogers et al failed to teach “Unified access management center....lists of callers”. However, Junkin teaches on column 2 line 65 to column 3 line 17 editing a database via an HTML-based internet browser.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al to have the “Unified access management center....lists of callers” as taught by Junkin such that the modified system of Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al would be able to support the system users convenience of to edit database by using an internet-web user interface.

Regarding “unified access management....number to said database”. The rejections as stated in claim 4 apply.

Regarding “user access control....editing said database”. The rejections as stated in claim 5 apply.

Rogers et al failed to teach “unified access management....(e-mail) message”. However, the rejections as stated in claim 7 apply.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al to have the “unified access management.....(e-mail) message” as taught by Yamaguchi such that the modified system of Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al would be able to support the system users convenience of receiving and processing telephone messages as email messages.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al as applied to claimed 4 above, and in view of Grimes, and in view of Cooper et al, and further in view of Yamaguchi (US: 6499055).

Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al and in view of Cooper et al as stated in claim 4 above failed to teach “unified access.....(e-mail) message”. However, Yamaguchi teaches on column 4 line 4-12 a WWW server for receiving and processing e-mails.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al, Grimes et al, Cooper et al to have the “unified access.....(e-mail) message” as taught by Yamaguchi such that the modified system of Rogers et al, Grimes et al, Cooper et al would be able to support the web site to the system users.

5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al, in view of Grimes et al and in view of Cooper et al as applied to claimed 2 above.

Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al and in view of Cooper et al failed to teach “location for disposing the user presence detection means”. However, “Official Notice” is taken that disposing the user presence detection means in a building where associates with a forwarding

destination number and the user may possibly present is old and well known to one skilled in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al and in view of Cooper et al to have the locations of a building and a vehicle such that the modified system of Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al and in view of Cooper et al would be able to support the system users conveniences of using the presence detection means at various places.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al as applied to claimed 2 above, and in view of Grimes et al, and in view of Cooper et al, and further in view of Porter (US: 6282270).

Rogers et al in view of Grimes et al in view of Cooper et al failed to teach “database further comprising.....destination URL”.

However, Porter teaches on Abstract that voice messages are forwarded from the WWW server to its client. The URL of the www client must be stored on the system.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers et al, in view of Grimes et al and in view of Cooper et al to have the “database further comprising.....destination URL” as taught by Porter such that the modified system of Rogers et al, Grimes et al, Cooper et al would be able to support the URL to the system users.

Response to Arguments

7. New grounds of rejections have been stated above and it lead this Office Action to be non-final.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not replied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Dezonno (US: 6449356) teaches method of multimedia transaction processing.

9. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (571) 272-7535. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (571) 272-7347. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2645

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to Central FAX Number 571-273-8300.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow

(W)


FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600